

**Minutes  
County Road Administration Board  
January 16-17, 2003  
CRAB Office – Olympia, Washington**

**Members Present:** Grant County Commissioner Tim Snead, Chair  
Asotin County Commissioner Don Scheibe, Vice-Chair  
Ken Stone, Cowlitz County Engineer  
Randy Casteel, Kitsap County Engineer  
Clark County Commissioner Judie Stanton  
Garfield County Commissioner Dean Burton  
Walla Walla County Commissioner Dave Carey  
Pierce County Council Member Harold Moss\*\*

**Staff Present:** Jay Weber, Executive Director  
Walt Olsen, Deputy Director  
Steve Hillesland, Assistant Director  
Karen Pendleton, Executive Assistant  
Chris Mudgett, Special Projects Manager\*  
Randy Hart, Grant Programs Manager  
Dave Whitcher, PMS Manager  
Larry Pearson, Maintenance Manager  
Steve Dietrich, Legal Counsel

**Guests:** Denise Tabler, Office of Financial Management/SACS  
Reid Wheeler, WMS  
Melissa Beard, House Transportation Committee  
Bob Davis, Walla Walla County  
Ross Kelley, Spokane County  
Jim Whitbread, Stevens County  
Phil Merrell, Walla Walla County  
Ramiro Chavez, Pierce County\*\*  
Scott Merriman, WSAC\*\*

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Snead called the County Road Administration Board quarterly meeting to order at 1:00 PM on Thursday, January 16, 2003, at the CRAB Office in Olympia.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Approve January 16-17, 2003 Agenda**

Commissioner Burton moved and Mr. Stone seconded to approve the agenda.

**Motion carried.**

\*1<sup>st</sup> day attendance only    \*\* 2nd day attendance only

### **Approve Minutes of October 10-11, 2002 CRABoard Meeting**

Commissioner Stanton moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to approve the minutes of the October 10-11, 2002, CRABoard meeting minutes.

**Motion carried.**

### **2002 Annual Report**

Chair Snead praised staff on a job well done with the 2002 CRAB Annual Report.

## **SPECIAL PROJECTS**

### **Proposed Revision to RCW 36.77.065**

Ms. Mudgett noted that as a result of changes to the Budget, Accounting, and Reporting System (BARS) Manual current legislation amending RCW 36.77.065 should be proposed during the 2003 legislation session.

After discussion Commissioner Stanton moved and Commissioner Carey seconded to ask the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) to pursue changes to RCW 36.77.065. **Motion carried.**

### **Proposed Revision to RCW 36.78.040**

Ms. Mudgett reviewed RCW 36.78.040 outlining the requirements and terms for county representation on the County Road Administration Board. She provided two options: Option one would change the population requirement from less than 12,500 to less than 20,000 for two County representatives; Option two would change the population requirement from less than 12,500 to less than 25,000 for two County representatives.

After Board discussion Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Casteel seconded to ask the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) to pursue changes to RCW 36.78.040 outlined in Option one. **Motion carried.**

### **MPO/RTPO Briefing Paper**

Ms. Mudgett provided an overview of the role of Regional Planning Organizations in transportation planning in Washington State as a result of expressed interest from Board members at the October 2002 CRABoard meeting.

### **Government to Government Training**

Ms. Mudgett reviewed a class on "Government to Government" training she recently attended.

## **BUDGET REPORT**

Ms. Tabler reviewed CRAB's current budget status through January 9, 2003.

## **DEPUTY DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **County Engineers/PWD Status**

Mr. Olsen reviewed the following changes in status of county engineers since October 2002:

- Pend Oreille County continues under Acting Engineer status with a Professional Engineer under contract. Public Works Director Paul Wilson will retire, effective February 28, 2003.
- San Juan County continues under Interim Engineer status. Position is out for advertisement at this time.
- Whatcom County hired Joe Rutan as County Engineer, effective January 6, 2003.
- Lewis County has appointed Engineer Pete Ringen to assume Interim Public Works Director duties and retain County Engineer duties as of January 6, 2003.
- Lincoln County Engineer Bob Breshears retired, effective November 30, 2002. Bill Johns, Adams County Engineer, agreed to provide County Engineer services until the position was filled. Lincoln County rehired Bob Breshears as County Engineer, effective January 7, 2003.
- Cowlitz County will reorganize effective February 1, 2003. Ken Stone has been named Public Works Director and Kent Cash has been named as County Engineer.

### **County Visits completed since October 2002**

Mr. Olsen reviewed the following Official County visits since the October 2002 CRABoard meeting:

October 22, 2002 – Grant County  
 October 23, 2002 – Yakima County  
 October 24, 2002 – Douglas County  
 November 19, 2002 – Cowlitz County

### **County Audits**

Mr. Olsen noted that CRAB has received audit reports for 17 counties since the October 2002 Board meeting. Specifically:

Grant County: SAO #63670, issued on September 13, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Yakima County: SAO #63880 and #64008, issued on September 20, 2002 and October 18, 2002, respectively, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Douglas County: SAO #63677 & #63678, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Pacific County: SAO #63996, issued on October 18, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Klickitat County: SAO #64026, issued on October 25, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Mason County: SAO #63832 & #64190, issued on September 20, 2002 and December 20, 2002, respectively, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Stevens County: SAO #63794, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Kitsap County: SAO #63798 & #64207, issued on September 20, 2002 and December 20, 2002, respectively, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Garfield County: SAO #64043 & #64044, issued on October 25, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2000 to December 31, 2000 and January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Chelan County: SAO #63710 & #63711, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated a prior finding that has been resolved and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

Kittitas County: SAO #63876 & #63877, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated two prior

findings (one has been resolved) and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

Franklin County: SAO #63848 & #63849, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Benton County: SAO #63806 & #63807, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated three prior findings (two have been resolved) and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

Thurston County: SAO #63860 & #63873, issued on September 19, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Clark County: SAO #63761 & 63762, issued on September 20, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated three prior findings (one has been resolved) and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

Pierce County: SAO #64252, issued on December 27, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

Island County: SAO #64265 & 64266, issued on December 27, 2002, covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated two prior findings (both are unresolved) and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

### **Other Activities**

Mr. Olsen reviewed his activities since the October 2002 CRABoard meeting:

First Wed of November, December & January:	WSEMCOT Mtg@ Camp Murray
October & November:	Budget Results Team meetings.
October 31:	APWA Fall Conf – Emergency Preparedness Training
November 19-21:	40 <sup>th</sup> Rd & Street Supervisor Conference Panel Moderator
December 3-5:	Threat & Risk Assessment Training – Olympia
December 9:	Fiscal Note Training
December 12:	SW Region RAP Meeting – Olympia
December 13 :	PS Region RAP Meeting – Olympia
December 1:	Defensive Driving Refresher

December 19:	First Aid Refresher
December 20:	State Auditors Exit Interview
January 8:	ESA Forum w/ FHWA & WSDOT

**Proposed 2003 County Visit Schedule & Documentation**

Mr. Olsen reviewed his and Mr. Weber's proposed county visit schedule for 2003:

January – Wahkiakum and Lewis  
February – Skamania and Clark  
March – Grays Harbor and Pacific  
April – Mason and Thurston  
May – Asotin  
June – Chelan, Ferry and Okanogan  
July – Adams, Spokane and Whitman  
August – Skagit and King  
September – Kittitas, Benton, Walla Walla and Columbia

He concluded by reviewing the format that will be used at county visit and additional documents to be used to show the State Auditor's office how CRAB staff monitors RAP.

## 2:00 PM - PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Snead opened the public hearing at 2:00 p.m.

### **WAC 136-150 – Fish Passage**

Chair Snead called for staff presentation regarding WAC 136-150.

Ms. Mudgett noted that the 2001 Legislature amended RCW 36.82.070 to allow the use of county road funds for the removal of barriers to fish passage related to county roads and limited funds that could be expended for these activities beyond the county road right-of-way. It also amended RCW 36.79.140 to exempt counties that choose to expend road funds in this manner, and within statutory limits, from the restriction on eligibility for Rural Arterial Trust Account (RATA) funds.

At its October meeting, the Board reviewed proposed revisions to WAC 136-150 that would bring the WAC into compliance with the revised statutes and scheduled a Public Hearing on the adoption of the proposed WAC revisions.

Ms. Mudgett reviewed the following comments received in response to the Public Hearing notice:

### **November 13, 2002. E-mail from Brent Holman, Skamania County Engineer.**

*"WAC 136-150-030. The eight thousand population number has not been increased forever. As the counties grow larger, I would think the population cutoff should increase also. We are reducing staff and need the authority for the smaller counties to not be burdened with all the new regs that make sense for larger counties because of the savings that can be made by the volume of work they do. This savings is not available in the smaller counties and more is spent on record keeping and reporting than is saved.*

*Consider increasing the population cutoff numbers to a more reasonable level."*

*An e-mail response was sent to Mr. Holman on November 18, 2002, indicating that currently the 8,000 population figure is set in statute, meaning that the Board is unable to change that figure by revising its WACs. The Board may want to discuss the desirability of requesting an amendment to the RCW to revise the 8,000 population cutoff.*

**November 20, 2002. E-mail from Bill Wright, Clark County Transportation Programming & Systems Manager.**

*"We are reviewing the proposed WAC changes and had some questions about the certification for fish barrier removal. Is this in response to an RCW? We are concerned about the accounting for this requirement. Would this WAC require separate accounting for project work that happens to extend beyond the ROW line, even if it's minor and incidental to bulk of a fish barrier removal project under a County Road? If so, accounting for this incidental work would be a burden.*

*We're also not excited about another certification requirement in general. We're currently evaluating the % limits and will get back to you with our comments, but we would appreciate any background on the need for the fish barrier WAC and how it might be applied."*

*The following e-mail response was set to Mr. Wright on November 21, 2002: "We're also not thrilled about another certification form but the need for this one kind of took us by surprise. The WAC change is in response to a change to RCW that the legislature made last session. I'm attaching the briefing paper that was prepared to give our Board the background on the proposed change. After reading it, if you have any other questions give me a call or send me an e-mail."*

*Staff has not been contacted by Mr. Wright since the response was sent.*

**December 4, 2002. E-mail from Don McInnes, Clallam County Engineer.**

*"The revision to WAC 136-150-023 provides that fish passage activities beyond the right-of-way do not exceed 25% of the total costs for activities related to fish barrier removal on any one project...*

*But the revision to WAC 136-150-030 provides that fish passage activities not exceed 25% of the total cost of activities on any one project.*

*If I understand the intent of the revisions, it looks like the words in WAC 136-150-023 should also be inserted in the revision to WAC 136-150-030. Otherwise the 25% figure will vary greatly depending upon if it is a percentage of only the fish barrier removal costs or if it is a percentage of the total cost."*

*An e-mail response was sent to Mr. McInnes on December 3, 2002, indicating that he was, indeed, correct. An amendment was prepared that, if adopted*



*by the Board, will correct the language in the proposed WAC amendment.  
(See page 5 of 5.)*

**December 4, 2002. Letter from Richard Snyder, Island County Engineer.**

*The letter received from Mr. Snyder and the response that was sent are attached to this recommendation.*

*The issue raised pertained to the 25% limit that has been imposed by statute and which the Board cannot revise via the WAC process.*

Ms. Mudgett concluded recommending that the Board adopt the proposed amendments to WAC 136-150, in order to bring the administrative rules governing eligibility for RATA funds into compliance with the RCW.

Chair Snead opened the floor for public testimony. Hearing none, Mr. Stone motioned and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to close the public hearing. **Motion carried.**

After discussion, Commissioner Scheibe moved to adopt changes to WAC 136-150 with amendments proposed by staff and Commissioner Stanton seconded. **Motion carried.**

**WAC 136-060 – County Road Log**

Chair Snead opened public hearing on WAC 136-060 County Road Log.

Chair Snead called for staff presentation regarding WAC 136-060.

Mr. Whitcher noted that WAC 136-60 was adopted when CRAB took over the responsibility of the maintenance of the County Roadlog from WSDOT, circa 1985. Over time, the roadlog and the update process have been redefined. The proposed updated WAC better describes how the update process currently works. These changes are technical in nature, creating no changes in the current roadlog and roadlog update process.

Mr. Whitcher concluded recommending changes to WAC 136-060.

Chair Snead opened for public comments. Hearing none, Commissioner Stanton moved and Commissioner Burton seconded to close the public hearing. **Motion carried.**

After discussion Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Stone seconded to adopt changes to WAC 136.060. **Motion carried.**

**WAC 136-163**

Chair Snead opened public hearing on WAC 136-163.

Chair Snead called for staff presentation regarding WAC 136-163.

Mr. Hart noted a grammatical error in reference to RCW 36.40.180 in WAC 136-163.

Chair Snead opened for public comments. Hearing none, Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to close the public hearing. **Motion carried.**

Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to adopt grammatical changes to WAC 136-163. **Motion carried.**

**RAP BUSINESS****Program Status Report**

Mr. Hart reviewed a one-page Rural Arterial Program status report.

**Regional Meeting Update**

Mr. Hart updated the Board on regional RAP meetings. Comments included 3R project submittals, noting that fewer projects are being funded due to increasing project size. Delays caused by right of way and environmental issues are making 3R an attractive option. The RATA funding average for projects has not increased because the region limits funding to \$500,000 per project. The 3R scope project has become increasingly attractive, especially near urbanizing areas, where full rural design standards are sometimes inappropriate. Furthermore, projects submitted as 3R are more likely to stay within that scope and retain their original rating as the project develops to construction.

Mr. Hart noted that per WAC 136-210-010, the CRABoard is directed to adopt design standards for RAP funded projects. The standards referenced further in the WAC are the City and County Design Standards, which are also part of the LAG Manual.

The remainder of the WAC describes how deviations from the City and County Design Standards will be allowed via WSDOT approval. However, since many RAP projects are actually 3R in scope, instead of approving a deviation, the WSDOT has provided a letter to the county concurring with the 2R scope or simply responded that a deviation request is not required. This is in keeping with the LAG manual, which, for 2R projects directs the engineer to follow the 3R scope process and "consider" design improvements, if they are warranted. "Consider", according to the WSDOT, simply means "document" the reasons for various design features chosen for or excluded from the project.

He concluded by reviewing a standard Engineer's 3R scope letter which will be attached to all future contract awards to counties. This documentation will fulfill the engineer's requirements implied in the WAC.

#### **Request for Public Hearing – WAC 136-161-080**

Mr. Hart reported that the NW region county engineers have met together to discuss funding limit issues over the last year and have recommended changes to WAC 136-161-080 regarding the limit of RATA funding for projects and counties. Whereas the project limit has been \$500,000 for a number of years, the counties recommend a higher limit of \$750,000 for one project per county per biennium given increased costs. (The engineers have also recommended a county limit of 20% to encourage the same number of counties to be able to compete, given the low amount of overall funding available to the region.)

Mr. Hart concluded by recommending these revisions be heard at a public hearing at the April 17-18, 2003 CRABoard meeting.

After discussion Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to set a public hearing for April 17, 2003 at 2:00 PM to review proposed changes regarding WAC 136-161-080. **Motion carried.**

#### **Apportion RATA Funds to Regions – Resolution 2003-002**

Mr. Hart presented Resolution 2003-002 to apportion RATA funds to regions. The resolution accrues \$5,036,271, now credited to RATA, be apportioned to the regions by the established 2001/03 biennium regional percentages after setting aside \$151,033 (3%) for administration.

After discussion Commissioner Carey moved and Mr. Casteel seconded to approve Resolution 2003-002. **Motion carried.**

#### **Project Requests**

##### **Chelan County**

Mr. Hart noted that Chelan County, per letter dated October 1, 2002, has requested a scope reduction for their Chumstick Highway 2 project. The request is to eliminate a curve improvement at a railroad crossing with no change in RATA funding.

Mr. Hart concluded that staff has reviewed the scope reduction request. The loss of alignment and accident rating points drops the project's score from 94.96 to 74.80. The lowest ranked and funded project on the same 1995-97 biennium array was Lincoln County's Bagdad Road at 54.10. Since the re-scoped Chumstick Highway 2

project still ranks above the funding cut-off, and the county is still committed to the remaining width, alignment and surfacing improvements in keeping with the 3R status of the submittal, CRAB staff recommends approval of the scope change with no change in RATA funding.

After discussion Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Stone seconded to approve Chelan County's scope reduction for their Chumstick Highway 2 project. **Motion carried.**

### **Spokane County**

Mr. Hart noted that Spokane County has requested a \$675,000 increase in RATA funding for their Prairie View Road in accordance with WAC 136-165-010. This is 24.9% of the originally allocated amount.

Mr. Ross Kelley, Spokane County Engineer provided a brief presentation in support of the scope change request.

Mr. Hart concluded that staff has reviewed Spokane County's increase request and related construction documents. CRAB funding was awarded to Spokane County based on their agreement to construct access to SR195. The Spokane County request is beyond the opportunity for approval by the CRABoard, according to WAC 136-165-020, (approvals limited to the preliminary engineering phase and prior to commencing construction). Although the access design required by WSDOT is much more expensive than the design assumed in the original proposal, these WSDOT requirements were in place well before the project commenced construction. Staff therefore recommends the request for additional RATA funding be denied.

The Board discussed the legal restrictions in approving the request in accordance to WAC 136-165-020.

Commissioner Burton moved that a letter explaining the Board's inability to approve the request, due to legal restriction in accordance with WAC 136-165-020, be sent to Spokane County, Mr. Casteel seconded. **Motion carried.**

### **Walla Walla County**

Mr. Hart introduced Mr. Phil Merrell, Walla Walla County Engineer.

Mr. Merrell discussed Walla Walla County's request for a scope change for their Sudbury Road at Rulo project. The request is to increase the original project limits 0.07 miles in order to construct one large curve in place of two smaller curves. The project would be lengthened an additional 0.07 miles or 370 feet with new mileposts at 10.13 to 10.83. The County is not asking for additional funding.

Mr. Hart concluded that staff has reviewed the request and discussed the improved features with Walla Walla County staff as well. The rating of the project will not change due to this minor increase in length. Staff agrees that using one curve instead of two is an improvement to the original proposal, and recommends approval of Walla Walla County's scope change request, establishing the new project limits as milepost 10.13 to milepost 10.83.

Commissioner Carey abstained from voting.

Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to approve Walla Walla County's scope change request for their Sudbury Road at Rulo project. **Motion carried.**

## **STAFF REPORTS**

### **Urban Area Transportation Boundaries**

Mr. Whitcher discussed the urban area transportation boundaries.

### **Information Services**

Mr. Hillesland discussed activities of the Information Service division staff.

### **Maintenance Management**

Larry Pearson presented a Power Point presentation on the status of the Maintenance Management program.

## **WALLA WALLA COUNTY CRVIEW PRESENTATION**

Bob Davis, Walla Walla County, gave an impressive presentation on Walla Walla County's CRView project.

Commissioner Carey moved and Mr. Stone seconded to recess the winter CRABoard meeting at 5:10 PM on January 16, 2003. The CRABoard meeting will resume January 17, 2003 at 9:00 A.M. **Motion carried.**

**County Road Administration Board**  
**January 17, 2003**  
**Friday**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Snead called to order the second day of the winter CRABoard meeting at 9:00 AM on January 17, 2003.

**COUNTY ROAD ADMINISTRATION BOARD PRESENTATION**

Mr. Hillesland and Mr. Olsen presented the County Road Administration Board Power Point presentation to the Board.

The Board commented and gave suggestions to improve the presentation.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**Resolution 2003-001 CAPA Distribution**

Mr. Weber presented Resolution 2003-001 regarding implementation of a pavement management system for the 2003 CAPA distribution. After discussion Commissioner Burton moved and Mr. Casteel seconded to adopt Resolution 2003-001, that for the purposes of determining each county's County Arterial Preservation Account eligibility for calendar year 2003, all of the thirty-nine counties are in substantial compliance with WAC 136-70-030. **Motion carried.**

**CRABoard Vacancies**

Mr. Weber announced that Bob Breshears, Lincoln County has retired from Lincoln County effective November 2002, therefore his position on the Board is available. Also, due to reorganization in Cowlitz County Ken Stone no longer holds the position of County Engineer, therefore his position on the Board is also available.

**RAP Eligibility**

Mr. Hart introduced Ramiro Chavez, Pierce County, to describe Pierce County's request for the Legislature to revise the Rural Arterial Program to change the way CRAB determines what County Roads are eligible for RATA funds.

Pierce County has requested that the Legislature revise RCW 36.79.010 to change the definition of roads eligible for improvement projects to the Arterials and Collectors as defined by their Local Function Classes for those Counties that have adopted Local Function Classes, and as defined by Federal Function Classes for those who have not adopted Local Function Classes. Gary Predoehl, P.E., Program Development Manager, Pierce County Public Works & Utilities - Transportation Services, has provided this explanation:

*"As we have discussed, attached is a Word document detailing the proposed revisions to the RAP statute in RCW 36.79. These proposed revisions attempt to rectify an issue that is resulting from the current 10-year update of the federal urban area boundaries. In the rapidly growing counties of western Washington, the amount of land classified as rural using the federal urban boundary definition is rapidly decreasing. This does not mean however, that the actual amount of rural land is decreasing. In fact much of land being newly designated as urban in the federal urban area update is actually designated as rural in the county's comprehensive plans. What this means is that many areas of the counties that really are rural and designated by the counties as rural will no longer be eligible for RAP funding. Many of the roads found in these areas are the prime projects for use of RAP funds because they are somewhat closer to the urban areas and have higher volumes along with many of the other factors that make them good RAP projects. What I am proposing is a revision to the definition of "rural" in the RCW that would allow projects outside the federal urban area boundary or within a rural area as designated by a locally designated comprehensive plan to be eligible for RAP funding. For apportionment purposes, however, I am suggesting that the definition stay as it is, i.e., based on the federal urban area boundary. What this does is allow more flexibility for use of the funds by those counties that plan under GMA and have lands that truly are rural, but are falling inside the federal urban area boundary, while at the same time not affecting the apportionment of funds as specified in the current formula and definitions. I believe this would be very beneficial to the western counties while not affecting or harming the eastern counties. Please let me know if you have any comments or questions relative to this proposal. I understand this will be an item of discussion at the CRAB meeting on January 16, 2003. I will be out of town and unable to attend, however, Ramiro Chavez will be in attendance and available for questions. Please let him know the exact time he will need to be in attendance. Thank you for your consideration and support."*

One counter-argument is that, in general, there are many Arterials and Collectors based on the Federal Function Class that are in need of RATA improvement funding, they can identify many appropriate projects to last for many biennia. The Federal Function Classes can be revised at any time by submitting a request thru WSDOT to FHWA, if a county has a 'burning need' to use RATA improvement funds on a Locally Classified Arterial or Collector that is not a Federally Classified Arterial or Collector, a request to revise their Federal Function Classes can be made.

Mr. Whitcher noted that a request has been made to change the definition of which County Roads are eligible for RATA improvement funds to 'those Arterials and Collectors not inside an Urban Growth Area (UGA)'. Several counties have established Urban Growth Areas, in compliance with the Growth Management Act, around their cities and more densely populated areas.

Their argument is that the Transportation Improvement Board uses the UGA for their eligibility definition in the Urbanized Areas. Making the UGA the boundary defining eligibility for RATA improvement funding will eliminate a current funding situation. With TIB and RATA using different boundaries for their eligibility definition, we have some county roads eligible for both TIB and RATA funds, some eligible for neither. Revising our eligibility definition will guarantee that every County Arterial and Collector will be eligible for one of the two funding sources.

The Transportation Improvement Board uses the Urban Place Boundary as the area of eligibility for the Urban Places. Several Urban Places are in or adjacent to Urban Growth Management Areas. TIB uses the federally designated Urban Area Boundary for their eligibility definition, the same definition used by RAP. This ensures that the County Arterials and Collectors around the Urban Places have a source of funding. If we change our eligibility definition to the UGA boundary, we have a situation similar to what we currently have in the Urbanized Areas; potentially no State-funding source for County Arterials and Collectors.

There are many Growth Management Areas around cities that are not Urbanized Areas or Urban Places. These areas are shown on the map of Highway Urban and Urbanized Areas plus GMA Boundaries. In Thurston County, Yelm, Rainier and Tenino are designated as Growth Management Areas, but are not Urban Places. Changing the RATA eligibility definition to the UGA will eliminate RATA funding for those County Arterials and Collectors in the UGA. One of the reasons CRAB supported the Urban Place definition rather than the Urban Cluster definition for the small urban areas was to allow RATA funds to be used for needed road improvements in these areas. To allow proper planning and growth management in the smaller urban areas, the need to use RATA improvement funds for the improvement of those roads near the small cities on a cooperative effort was vital. Those areas inside UGAs would be eligible for TIB funds, but TIB admits that they will not rank high enough to ever receive funding.

These two requests may be the same request. If a county is planning in accordance with the Growth Management Act, its urban areas defined in its comprehensive plan should be the areas within the Growth Management Area Boundaries. This brings up the question of Design Standards.

RAP is based on Rural Design Standards, as defined by the Local Agency Guidelines. If a RAP project is within the Urban Area Boundary but classified as Rural by the county, should the project be designed to Rural Standards, Urban Standards, or the county's locally adopted design standards?



If this proposed change is not made, another situation arises. If a RAP project is federally functionally classified as Rural (outside the Urban Area boundary) but is locally functionally classified as Urban (within the Growth Management Area Boundary), should RATA funds pay for the additional costs required to design and construct a road to urban standards?

Mr. Whitcher concluded with the following recommendations for the Boards consideration:

The CRABoard make no decision until additional specifics and other information is available.

Direct CRAB staff to determine what the effects of these two requests would have on the Rural Arterial Program and counties in general.

Direct CRAB staff to work with each county to determine the impact if either is adopted.

Direct CRAB staff to develop a proposed policy on design standards for RAP projects, in relation to the several combinations of Urban Areas and Growth Management Areas and local standards.

After Board discussion Council Member Moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to proceed with staff's recommendations. **Motion carried.**

## **LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

Mr. Weber discussed the Governor's budget proposal.

Chair Snead presented Ken Stone with a plaque in appreciation for his time serving on the County Road Administration Board.

Mr. Carey moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to adjourn at 12:35 PM. **Motion carried.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_